

**CADD/GIS Technology Center Environmental Field Working Group (FWG)
April 24 – 25, 2002 Meeting
Atlanta, Georgia
Minutes**

Meeting Time/Date:

0800 - 1730/April 24, 2002
0800 – 1200/April 25, 2002

Meeting Location:

Tetra Tech EMI, 101 Marietta Street, Suite 2400, Atlanta, GA

Attendees:

1. Sam Bass, USACE Omaha District, NE, phone: 402-697-2654, e-mail: don.b.bass@usace.army.mil
2. Lasandra Teeters, Patuxent River Naval Air Warfare Center, Lexington Park, MD, phone: 301-757-4872, e-mail: teeterslc@navair.navy.mil
3. Jerry Dunn, Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Commerce City, CO, phone: 303-289-0291, e-mail: jdunn@rma.army.mil
4. Tom Stephan, Navy Engineering Field Activity NE, Lester, PA, phone: 610-595-0567 ext. 169, e-mail: thstephan@efdnorth.navfac.navy.mil
5. Bobby Carpenter, CADD/GIS Technology Center, Vicksburg, MS, phone: 601-634-4572, e-mail: Bobby.G.Carpenter@erdc.usace.army.mil
6. Parrish Swearingen, Tetra Tech EMI, Warner Robins, GA, phone: 478-329-1616, e-mail: parrish.swearingen@ttemi.com
7. Thuy-Kieu (Q) Chang, Tetra Tech EMI, Atlanta, GA, phone: 404-225-5513, e-mail: thuykieu.chang@ttemi.com
8. Joe Jahnke, Tetra Tech EMI, Warner Robins, GA, phone: 478-329-1616, e-mail: joe.jahnke@ttemi.com

Purpose of Meeting:

The purpose of the meeting was to review and discuss CADD/GIS Technology Center Project No. 01.040, entitled “Use of GIS to Simplify the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP)”.

Information and project deliverables are available at:

http://tsc.wes.army.mil/contacts/groups/FWG/Environmental/envprojects/01.040/01_040.htm

Summary of Discussion:

The CADD/GIS Technology Center had provided funds to the Air Force (Robins AFB) in FY01 for award of a contract to Tetra Tech EMI for project development. EIAP Checklist websites and tools developed by Robins AFB and the Patuxent River Naval Air Station were used as the baseline for

project development. The CADD/GIS Technology Center Environmental FWG was assigned oversight of the project.

Review of Documentation entitled “Comparison of Robins AFB Web-Based and Naval Air Station Patuxent River GIS-Based Environmental Impact Analysis Process” -

Approach and System Architecture – The project development approach and EIAP Architecture were revisited and discussed. A detailed discussion is included in the technical report entitled “Comparison of Robins AFB Web-Based and Naval Air Station Patuxent River GIS-Based Environmental Impact Analysis Process”. Items of discussion included:

- a. The EIAP Application will be available for download from the CADD/GIS Center website. It should be installed on an Intranet server, with the organization’s NEPA Manager/Coordinator having editing authority.
- b. A brief Users Manual should be prepared. The Users Manual should provide a basic overview of the EIAP Application and NEPA Checklist, and instructions for set-up and use.
- c. In Phase 1, the NEPA Checklist Questions and Output (i.e., data) are saved to a text file. In Phase 2, the data should be maintained in an Access database.
- d. Review feasibility of permitting the installation level NEPA Manager to be able to modify the questions or to change the logic tree. All questions may not apply to all projects, and answering "No" to a question if it does not apply may send you down a different branch of the logic tree.

Review of NEPA Checklist Questions and Environmental Planning Checklist Website – The NEPA checklist questions were reviewed and discussed in great detail. Items of discussion included:

- a. Need to reference the primary federal laws pertaining to each checklist question. Would identify how to link to Federal Real Property website (on Center website) in Phase 2 (FY02 funding). Cornell University has a website containing laws and regulations.
- b. The wording of each checklist bullet should be reviewed and reworded (if necessary) for application to a wider scope of military installations, USACE civil works projects, etc. Examples are:
 - (1) “Deer Auto Collision” – Might change to “Wildlife Migration Patterns”.
 - (2) “Bird/Aircraft Collision”
 - (3) Cumulative Effect – Example: Several projects close to a wetland will have a greater impact than one.
- c. Add a “Comment” button, which the user could use to add site-specific comments and observations for future reference.
- d. PAX had categorized their NEPA Checklist questions as:

- (1) Planner Checklist – General questions.
- (2) Operational Checklist – More detailed questions.

e. Include fields for “Work Item Number”, “Asset ID” (Tracking Number), “Point-of-Contact”, “Team”, “Status” (e.g., complete, incomplete, in-progress), and “Approved Date” (i.e., the date approved by the organization’s NEPA Manager).

f. The SDSFIE Entity Types listed for reference with each NEPA Checklist Question resulted in considerable discussion. The listed SDSFIE Entity Types would include the GIS map features that the NEPA Manager might need to answer each specific checklist question. Items of discussion included:

- (1) The listing of SDSFIE Entity Types should be described as the “minimum” or “recommended” ones needed to be depicted on a GIS map for each specific question.

- (2) Some questions are not map specific. The PAX Checklist has 26 questions which are not map specific. Maps may not be required for each question, but the listed Entity Types are recommended.

- (3) Use the “Whole System Approach” – Identify SDSFIE Entity Class (e.g., a specific Utilities Entity Set Entity Class) which is most appropriate, and include specific Entity Types from other areas of the SDSFIE.

- (4) Reference the SDSFIE Release Number the Entity Types are based upon (e.g., SDSFIE/FMSFIE Release 2.10).

Administrator Tools (Access Database) - The NEPA Checklist and EIAP administration tools were reviewed and discussed. The primary emphasis is to provide simple forms and tools based upon Microsoft Access, which will not require annual maintenance.

Future Development - Several items were discussed for possible accomplishment with the approved FY02 funding, or with proposed FY03 funding.

- a. Linking to the appropriate laws and regulations on the Real Property Management Regulations website.

- b. Adding a “Copy and Edit” option for copying and editing of similar projects. For example, an organization may have one or more projects involving minor repairs or painting of several buildings. The NEPA Manager would have to complete the entire NEPA Checklist for each separate building. A “Copy and Edit” option would save a considerable amount of time because of the similarity of the work to be accomplished on each building.

- c. Ensure that the NEPA Checklist also addresses USACE civil works projects.

Action Items: Several comments were provided to Tetra Tech EMI for incorporation and finalization of the FY01 funded effort. Scheduled action items and target dates are:

a. A follow-up review and FY02 development meeting was scheduled for June 4 (beginning at 0830) at the Joint FWG/Corporate Staff Meeting at Ft Worth, TX.

b. May 3 – Parrish to prepare and submit draft time and cost estimate for FY02 project development (based upon comments from meeting) to Center (i.e., Bobby).

c. May 17 – Environmental FWG Members to submit any additional comments (via email) concerning the Recommended Entity Types (Appendix C of “Comparison of Robins AFB Web-Based and Naval Air Station Patuxent River GIS-Based Environmental Impact Analysis Process”) to Parrish.

Goals Accomplished: The FY01 funded effort on Project 01.040 was currently approximately 90 percent complete at the time of the meeting. The Environmental FWG members provided good input and comments, which will ultimately result in a high quality CADD/GIS Technology Center project.

Comments & Suggestions from Review of Meeting Minutes

1. Initial Comment by Sam Bass (May 1, 2002) - Didn't we have some discussion about allowing the questions to be modified at the installation level, or to change the logic tree? All questions may not apply to all projects, and answering "No" to a question if it does not apply may send you down a different branch of the logic tree. Can't remember how (or if) we resolved this. Granted, this is not something you want every user doing (changing questions/logic), but it could be within the NEPA Manager's administrative toolbox for the application.

a. Bobby Bean (May 6, 2002) - I think what we had agreed upon that the Federal Questions would be managed as a Center Admin function but when we got to the State level Questions those would be administered by a local Administrator. So we need to keep the two Admin functions separated. The Center would put out a new federal version at least once a year was the thought process. Hope this helps.

b. Gerald O'Hara (May 6, 2002) - I agree. Although I did miss this last meeting, It has been my understanding from prior meetings that this was one of the fundamental notions all along.

c. Sam Bass (May 6, 2002) - Thanks for the clarification Bobby (Bean). Makes sense to me. Of course, where does the funding come from for the Center to maintain this tool after it is fielded?

d. Bobby Bean (May 6, 2002) - Sam the thought is we will need to budget Center Project funds to maintain this standard just like what we would do for any other standard that we create. The difference is this is a project standard more so than a data standard. I think once we get it fielded the changes should not be all that drastic, so It would become a component of one of the Standards. As this one is more FM related more than GIS, I suspect it would become a component of that standard. If we make it so that it is being used. I am pretty sure the Center will support the effort.

2. Initial Comment by Gerald O'Hara (May 6, 2002) - [I'm sorry I couldn't attend the meeting. I've reviewed the documents forwarded by Mr. Carpenter and tripped over the following:](#)

b. The wording of each checklist bullet should be reviewed and reworded (if necessary) for application to a wider scope of military installations, USACE civil works projects, etc. Examples are:

(1) "Deer Auto Collision" - Might change to "Wildlife Migration Patterns".

(2) "Bird/Aircraft Collision"

(3) Cumulative Effect - Example: Several projects close to a wetland will have a greater impact than one.

[May I suggest the following wording?](#)

b. The wording of each checklist bullet should be reviewed and reworded (if necessary) for application to a wider scope of military installations, USACE civil works projects, etc. Examples are:

(1) "Deer Auto Collision" & "Bird/Aircraft Collision" - Might change to "Wildlife Migration Patterns".

(2) Cumulative Effect - Example: Several projects close to a wetland will have an impact greater than the simple sum total of each project.

a. Bobby Bean (May 6, 2002) - Gerald sounds like some good suggestions to me. We need to make the questions broad so that it can be applied more widely in our Federal Environment. So we need change our wording to reflect a Federal approach.